

From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

PCT

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL
OF COPIES OF TRANSLATION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT
ON PATENTABILITY
(CHAPTER I OR CHAPTER II
OF THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY)
(PCT Rules 44bis.3(c) and 72.2)

To:

KYOWA HAKKO KOGYO CO., LTD.
6-1, Ohtemachi 1-chome
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 1008185
JAPON



Date of mailing (day/month/year) 02 March 2006 (02.03.2006)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 1549	IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION
International application No. PCT/JP2004/004601	International filing date (day/month/year) 31 March 2004 (31.03.2004)
Applicant KYOWA HAKKO KOGYO CO., LTD. et al	

1. Transmittal of the translation to the applicant.

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I).

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II).

2. Transmittal of the copy of the translation to the designated or elected Offices.

The International Bureau notifies the applicant that copies of that translation have been transmitted to the following designated or elected Offices requiring such translation:

None

The following designated or elected Offices, having waived the requirement for such a transmittal at this time, will receive copies of that translation from the International Bureau only upon their request:

AE, AG, AL, AM, AP, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DZ, EA, EQ, EE, EG, EP, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MZ, NA, NI, NO, NZ, OA, OM, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RU, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SY, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, YU, ZA, ZM, ZW

3. Reminder regarding translation into (one of) the official language(s) of the elected Office(s).

The applicant is reminded that, where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II).

It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned within the applicable time limit (Rule 74.1). See Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide for further details.

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer Yoshiko Kuwahara
Facsimile No.+41 22 740 14 35	Facsimile No.+41 22 338 90 90

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 1549	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/JP2004/004601	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 31 March 2004 (31.03.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 31 March 2003 (31.03.2003)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant KYOWA HAKKO KOGYO CO., LTD.			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).

Date of issuance of this report 22 February 2006 (22.02.2006)	
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Authorized officer Yoshiko Kuwahara Telephone No. +41 22 338 90 90

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 1549		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	
International application No. PCT/JP2004/004601	International filing date (day/month/year) 31.03.2004	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC			
Applicant KYOWA HAKKO KOGYO CO., LTD.			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Façsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/004601

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 in written format
 in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/004601

Box No. III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application
 claims Nos. 8-15

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 8-15
 relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):

The inventions of claims 8-15 concern a method for treating the human body by therapy, which does not require an examination by the International Preliminary Examining Authority (PCT Article 34(4)(a)(i) and Rule 67.1(iv)).

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____
 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported
 by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 8-15

the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/004601

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-7, 16-22	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-7, 16-22	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-7, 16-22	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

This opinion was expressed based on the following document cited in the international search report.

Document 1: WO 96/36624 A1 (Kyowa Hakko Kogyo Co., Ltd.) & EP 771794 A1
oClaims 1-7 and 16-22

Document 1 (Claims; Example 140) describes the compounds specifically used in the inventions of this application. In addition, the specification (page 61, line 15 to page 63, line 3) describes a spray preparation as a specific dosage form and its use for administration to the airway. This being the case, when we compare the inventions of claims 1-7 and 16-22 with the invention described in document 1, they seem to differ because the former describes the ratio between the lung tissue concentration and plasma concentration.

However, in looking at the specification, no explanation whatsoever is provided concerning a specific means of obtaining this ratio, and because this examination finds that if the ingredients described in document 1 are used it will be possible to obtain that ratio, no clear difference between the two can be found.

As a result, based on the description in document 1, the inventions of claims 1-7 and 16-22 lack novelty and an inventive step.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/004601

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

1. Certain published documents (Rule 43bis.1 and 70.10)

Application No. Patent No.	Publication date (day/month/year)	Filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid claim) (day/month/year)
WO 03/066044 A1	14.08.2003	31.01.2003	08.02.2002

[EX]

2. Non-written disclosures (Rule 43bis.1 and 70.9)

Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-written disclosure (day/month/year)	Date of written disclosure referring to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/004601

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 1-7 and 16-22

The inventions of claims 1-7 and 16-22 are characterized by the fact that when a compound or salt thereof having PDE-IV inhibitory activity is administered to the airway, the ratio of the concentration in lung tissue to the concentration in plasma is a set value or less. However, in looking at the specification, no explanation whatsoever is provided concerning the specific means whereby this ratio can be obtained, and in looking at the Examples only the drug having as its active ingredient the compound having the chemical structure represented by Formula (II) of claim 7 is listed as satisfy this ratio. Moreover, this matter cannot be considered obvious to persons skilled in the art.

This being the case, the inventions of claims 1-7 and 16-22 do not satisfy the requirement for specificity to the extent that a meaningful opinion can be rendered concerning the specification.

As stated above, because the specification of this application does not satisfy the requirement for specificity, this opinion considered only instances in which the compounds that were actually administered to the airway in the Examples of the specification were used as compounds having PDE-IV inhibitory action.